



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,157	09/19/2003	Mutsumi Katayama	HGM-108-A	8732
21828 7590 01/03/2008 CARRIER BLACKMAN AND ASSOCIATES 24101 NOVI ROAD SUITE 100 NOVI, MI 48375			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/03/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

cbalaw@gmail.com  
cbalaw@ameritech.net  
wblackman@ameritech.net

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/667,157

**Applicant(s)**

KATAYAMA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Tuan H. Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 9-11, 14, 17 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5-8, 12-13, 15-16, 18-21, 25 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see applicant's remarks, filed on 10/03/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Van Valkenburg (US PUB. 2005/0180343 hereinafter, "Van") and Lempio et al. (U.S PAT. 6,831,896 hereinafter, "Lempio").

### ***Drawings***

2. The originally-filed drawings have been approved for publication.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Valkenburg (US PUB. 2005/0180343 hereinafter, "Van").

Consider claim 1, Van teaches a wireless network system for use with two vehicles, system comprising: a first relay device (first device) including first and second Bluetooth modules capable of performing a cable communication irrespective of which is a master or slave, wherein relay device is configured to be mounted to a first vehicle of said two vehicles (page 2 [0024] and page 3 [0033] i.e., in the simplest case such a device can be embodied as a computer or a network device with two different Bluetooth modules that can be operated independently. In this case it has to be prevented that one of said modules connects the other vial a piconet connection, and that both modules operate their piconets synchronously. An inter piconet communication enabled device may only comprise a single transceiver, if the device is operated in one piconet as a slave and in the other piconet as a master or slave); and at least one first wireless terminal including a third Bluetooth module, wherein the first and third Bluetooth

modules structure a first piconet in which the first Bluetooth module is a master, and the third Bluetooth module is a slave (page 3 [0033]), the second Bluetooth module structures a second piconet (page 3 [0033]); and wherein the first piconet and the second piconet structure a network (page 3 [0033] i.e., operating said transmitting and receiving to connect the device with at least a first piconet and a second piconet at the same time, i.e. simultaneously or at different times).

Consider claim 14, Van teaches in a wireless network system constructed by a plurality of Bluetooth terminals for use on two vehicles, wherein the system comprises: a first relay device including first and second Bluetooth modules, each of the Bluetooth modules performs a cable communication irrespective of which is a master/slave, wherein said first relay device is configured to be mounted on a first vehicle (page 2 [0024] and page 3 [0033] i.e., in the simplest case such a device can be embodied as a computer or a network device with two different Bluetooth modules that can be operated independently. In this case it has to be prevented that one of said modules connects the other via a piconet connection, and that both modules operate their piconets synchronously. An inter piconet communication enabled device may only comprise a single transceiver, if the device is operated in one piconet as a slave and in the other piconet as a master or slave); and at least one first wireless terminal including a third Bluetooth module, and in the method, the first and third Bluetooth modules communicate with each other on a first piconet in which the first Bluetooth module is a master, and the third Bluetooth module is a slave (page 3 [0033]), the second Bluetooth

Art Unit: 2618

module communicates with any one of the other Bluetooth modules on a second piconet (page 3 [0033]); the first Piconet and the other piconet structure a network (page 3 [0033] i.e., operating said transmitting and receiving to connect the device with at least a first piconet and a second piconet at the same time, i.e. simultaneously or at different times).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4, 9-11, 17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van in view of Lempio et al. (U.S PAT. 6,831,896 hereinafter, "Lempio").

Consider claims 4 and 17, Van teaches a wireless network system for use with two vehicles, system comprising: a first relay device including first and second Bluetooth modules capable of performing a cable communication irrespective of which is a master or slave, wherein relay device is configured to be mounted to a first vehicle of said two vehicles.

Van does not explicitly show that the first and third Bluetooth modules communicate with each other with transmission electricity conforming to a class 2 or 3 (read on broadcast range of several meters, e.g. class 3 has the maximum range is 10 meters) of a Bluetooth standard.

In the same field of endeavor, Lempio teaches the first and third Bluetooth modules communicate with each other with transmission electricity conforming to a class 2 or 3 (read on broadcast range of several meters, e.g. class 3 has the maximum range is 10 meters) of a Bluetooth standard (col. 1 lines 25-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, the first and third Bluetooth modules communicate with each other with transmission electricity conforming to a class 2 or 3 (read on broadcast range of several meters, e.g. class 3 has the maximum range is 10 meters) of a Bluetooth standard, as taught by Lempio, in order to provide a short range RF network having routing capabilities for communicating data between one or more terminal devices and/or a host among a select one of a plurality of communication paths.

Consider claims 9 and 22, Ross further teaches an SCO link or an ACL link is established between the Bluetooth modules (page 3 [0022]).

Consider claims 10 and 23, Lempio further teaches in the first relay device, the first and second Bluetooth modules are controlled by common control means (fig. 2A

Art Unit: 2618

col. 4 lines 33-41).

Consider claims 11 and 24, Lempio further teaches the first and second Bluetooth modules and the control means are connected together via a bus (fig. 2A col. 4 lines 33-41).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 2-3, 5-8, 12-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 25-26 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop\_\_\_\_\_ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:



Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571)272-7882882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2618 T.S

  
NAY MAUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER